



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/537,298

06/02/2005

Tomohisa Tenra

043890-0746

8367

20277 7590 11/09/2007
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
600 13TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

THOMAS, ALEXANDER S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/09/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/537,298

Applicant(s)

TENRA ET AL.

Examiner

Alexander Thomas

Art Unit

1794

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Alexander Thomas/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1794

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicants argue that the cited references do not disclose "that the enveloping member is heated and pressed in a portion where the core member is present within the enveloping member, and at portions of said enveloping member where said core member is not present with the enveloping member". However, this is not convincing of patentability because the fact that the product is "heated" and "pressed" does not add any structural features to the claimed product. Furthermore, the fact that something is heated and pressed does not necessarily require that a physical change, i.e. a heat seal, has occurred. Concerning the limitation "wherein the portions of said heat seal layer where said core member is not present with the enveloping member are closely attached to each other and heated and fused so as to be along the core member shape at the border between the portion ... not present", the references each disclose this feature. For example, the borders of the enveloping material in the references are heat sealed together around the core material. These borders areas in the references' product may be considered "portions of said heat seal layer where the core member is not present within the enveloping member" and they are also along, i.e. next to, the "core member shape". The inner portion of the heat sealed borders next to the core material may be considered to be along the core member at the border between the core member and a portion where the core member is not present within the enveloping member, namely the outer portions of the heat sealed borders. As such, claim 2 is anticipated by each reference. Regarding applicants' discussion of claims 8-10 and the rejection under 35 USC 103, the rejections set forth in the previous office action do set forth reasoning to support the conclusion of obviousness. Specifically, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a hole in the products of the primary references in view of the teachings in the secondary reference in order to allow a tube to pass through the insulation after installation. Applicants' discussion of the '686 product as being "welded" is also not convincing. In the final products a welded joint is patentably indistinct from a heat sealed joint. Furthermore, it is noted that "686 describes heat joining the resin layers by welding with heating, i.e. heat sealing. This welding with heating around the holes in the reference's product results in heat sealed layers which are fused over portions of the holes in the core material and along the shape of the through holes as instantly claimed.